

CHATS BY THE WAY.

Ex-Governor William Pinckney Whyte, of Maryland, is eighty years old, but he is going to stump Maryland and West Virginia for the Democratic ticket. Something of the spirit of "70 animates Democrats, old and young, this year. It is a splendid sign. It points to victory.

Hon. Trus L. Norris, National Committeeman from New Hampshire, had this comment to make on the situation: "A few days ago I should have said that the chances were about even between the two candidates. To-day the outlook is so much brighter for the Democrats that I believe Judge Parker a certain winner. He will sweep the States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut and will carry at least two middle and two mountain States.

More than passing strange it is that American products continue to be sold in foreign parts cheaper than at home. Even sewing machines, distinctively an American production, far surpassing in merit and cheapness of cost of manufacture any like machine of foreign origin, costs the home buyer nearly 100 per cent. more than the foreigner has to pay for it.

Mr. Roosevelt announces that agreement with him is the one credible evidence that a man is a "good American," and failure to agree with him proof of indifference to the "welfare of the nation." It is a simple test. On the basis of the election returns of 1900, when he was a candidate for the Vice-Presidency, 485 voters of every 1000 came under this condemnation. If as many as two in 100 should show like contumacy the country, logically, would go rapidly to ruin. Such profound confidence in himself and the party he leads fully explains Mr. Roosevelt's aspersions of the motives and character of his opponents. But it does not quite excuse it.

Republican "prosperity" talk—What shall be said of the Democratic increase in American tonnage engaged in foreign trade from 609,921 in 1890 to 2,546,237 in 1890, a Democratic increase per decade of forty-six per cent., as against the decrease from 2,546,237 in 1890 to 826,964 in 1900, a Republican decrease of sixteen per cent. per decade?—Edward M. Shepard.

Republican "prosperity" talk—What shall be said of the Democratic increase in our total domestic merchandise exported from \$31,000,000 in 1890 to \$116,000,000 in 1900, or an average Democratic increase of 133 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$31,000,000 in 1890 to \$1,370,000,000 in 1900, and increase of only 83.5 per cent. per decade?—Edward M. Shepard.

Prosperity is not the product of politicians nor of Government policies. It is the joint product of God and man. It comes from the benevolence of nature in giving us rain and sunshine, combined with the industry and the intelligence of the American farmers and laborers of every class.—Senator Jos. W. Bailey, of Texas.

Every German newspaper in New York City is against Roosevelt. This is official. At least the statement is made on the authority of Joseph Winter, the man who organized the Roosevelt German-American League.

Mr. Cleveland's statement that the State ticket fairly represents "the fighting strength of New York's Democracy" is the opinion of a man who knows New York, who knows fighters and who knows Democracy.—New York World.

One of the great founders of the Republican party, when it was consecrated to the cause of the abolition of slavery, advises negroes not to vote the Republican ticket, and it is no less than former Secretary George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts.

Of all the travesties on sincerity is the kind of talk the Republican candidate for Vice-President is using, especially when he said, speaking of our foreign relations, "We need no allies except those of truth and justice." How does that comport with the speak-softly, big-stick policy—the utterance of the Rough Rider President?

The New York Times, speaking of Mr. Roosevelt's recent letter of acceptance of the Republican nomination, says: "No such astonishing document has ever before been issued by a President of the United States or by a candidate for President. It sounds like a voice from the King of Abyssinia. Its aim is certainly not to tell the truth, but to put the President's opponents 'in a hole.'"

"Chicago," said T. C. Newman, of that city, "will give from 40,000 to 60,000 for Parker. If we can hold the majorities down in the big Republican counties the Illinois electoral vote will surely be cast for the constitutional party."

James H. Tallaferrro, West Virginia: "My State is no longer doubtful. We will wipe out McKinley's 18,000 and land with 15,000 for Parker and Davis."

Senator Culberson, of Texas, who has just gone on a speaking tour, dropped in at Democratic headquarters to-day. He said: "I have no doubt whatever of Democratic success. All the signs point to a victory for our party. I not only believe we will carry the States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, but I also feel confident we will win two of the middle Western States and will pick up a few votes in the inter-mountain States. At least, that is the information I have been receiving from persons thoroughly posted on conditions in the States I have named."

ALTON B. PARKER'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE

An Eloquent, Sobering and Saving Appeal to the American People No Longer to Permit Themselves to Be Fooled and Misled.

It is Addressed to Men Who Think—It is a Warning, a Strong Voice Through the Darkness and Storm Telling of Peril and How to Escape It—He Urges Economy, Equal Opportunity Tariff Reform, Rule of the Law.

To the Honorable Champ Clark and Others, Committee, etc.:

Gentlemen—In my response to your committee, at the formal notification proceedings, I referred to some matters not mentioned in this letter. I desire that these be considered as incorporated herein, and regret that lack of space prevents specific reference to them all. I wish here, however, again to refer to my views there expressed as to the gold standard, to declare again my unqualified belief in said standard, and to express my appreciation of the action of the convention in reply to my communication upon that subject.

Grave public questions are pressing for decision. The Democratic party appeals to the people with confidence that its position on these questions will be accepted and endorsed at the polls. While the issues involved are numerous, some stand forth pre-eminent in the public mind. Among these are tariff reform, imperialism, economical administration and honesty in the public service. I shall briefly consider these and some others within the necessarily prescribed limits of this letter.

EXECUTIVE ENCROACHMENT.

While I presented my views at the notification proceedings concerning this vital issue, the overshadowing importance of this question impels me to refer to it again. The issue is often-times referred to as "Constitutionalism vs. Imperialism."

If we would retain our liberties and constitutional right unimpaired, we cannot permit or tolerate, at any time or for any purpose, the arrogation of unconstitutional powers by the executive branch of our Government. We should be ever mindful of the words of Webster, "Liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints and just divisions of political powers."

Already the National Government has become centralized beyond any point contemplated or imagined by the framers of the Constitution. How tremendously all this has added to the powers of the President! It has developed from year to year until it almost equals that of many monarchs. While the growth of our country and the magnitude of interstate interests may seem to furnish a plausible reason for this centralization of power, yet these same facts afford the most potent reason why the Executive should not be permitted to encroach upon the other departments of the Government, and assume legislative, or other powers, not expressly conferred by the Constitution.

The magnitude of the country and its diversity of interests and population would enable a determined, ambitious and able Executive, unimpaired of constitutional limitations and fired with the lust of power, to go far in the usurpation of authority and the aggrandizement of personal power before the situation could be fully appreciated or the people be aroused.

The issue of imperialism which has been thrust upon the country involves a decision whether the law of the land or the rule of individual caprice shall govern. The principle of imperialism may give rise to brilliant, startling, dazzling results, but the principle of democracy lights in check the brilliant Executive and subjects him to the sober, conservative control of the people.

The people of the United States stand at the parting of the ways. Shall we follow the footsteps of our fathers along the paths of peace, prosperity and contentment, guided by the ever-living spirit of the Constitution, which they framed for us, or shall we go along other and untrodden paths, hitherto shunned by all, following blindly new ideals, which, though appealing with brilliancy to the imagination and ambition, may prove a will of the wisp, leading us into difficulties from which it may be impossible to extricate ourselves without lasting injury to our National character and institutions?

TARIFF REFORM AT ONCE.

Tariff reform is one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith, and the necessity for it was never greater than at the present time. It should be undertaken at once in the interest of all our people.

The Dingley tariff is excessive in many of its rates, and as to them at least, unjustly and oppressively burdens the people. It secures to domestic manufacturers, singly or in combination, the privilege of exacting excessive prices at home and prices far above the level of sales made regularly by them abroad with profit, thus giving a bounty to foreigners at the expense of our own people. Its unjust taxation burdens the people generally, forcing them to pay excessive prices for food, fuel, clothing and other necessities of life. It levies duty on many articles not normally imported in any considerable amount, which are made extensively at home, for which the most extreme protectionist would hardly justify protective taxes, and which in large amounts are exported. Such duties have been and will continue to be a direct incentive to the formation of huge industrial combinations, which, secure from foreign competition, are enabled to stifle domestic competition and practically to monopolize the home market.

It contains many duties imposed for the express purpose only, as was openly avowed, of furnishing a basis for reduction by means of reciprocal trade treaties, which the Republican administration, implicitly, at least, promised to negotiate. Having on this promise secured the increased duties, the Republican party leaders, spurred on by protected interests, defeated the treaties negotiated by the Executive, and now these same interests cling to the benefit of these duties which the people never intended they should have, and to which they have no moral right. Even now the argument most frequently urged in behalf of the Dingley

tariff, and against tariff reform generally, is the necessity of caring for our infant industries. Many of these industries, after a hundred years of lusty growth, are looming up as industrial giants. In their case, at least, the Dingley tariff invites combination and monopoly, and gives justification to the expression that the tariff is the mother of trusts.

For the above mentioned reasons, among many others, the people demand reform of these abuses, and such reform demands and should receive immediate attention.

HOPE OF AID FROM THE SENATE

The two leading parties have always differed as to the principle of customs taxation. Our party has always advanced the theory that the object is the raising of revenue for support of the Government whatever other results may incidentally flow therefrom. The Republican party, on the other hand, contends that customs duties should be levied primarily for protection, so-called, with revenue as the subordinate purpose, thus using the power of taxation to build up the business and property of the few at the expense of the many.

This difference of principle still subsists, but our party appreciates that the long-continued policy of the coun-

try, inadequate, contrary to my expectations, I favor such further legislation, within constitutional limitations, as will best promote and safeguard the interests of all the people.

Whether there is any common law which can be applied and enforced by the Federal courts, cannot be determined by the President, or by a candidate for the Presidency.

The determination of this question was left by the people in framing the Constitution, to the Judiciary and not to the Executive. The Supreme Court of the United States has recently considered this question, and in the case of the Western Union Telegraph Company vs. the Call Publishing Company, to be found in the one hundred and eighty-first volume of the United States Supreme Court reports, at page 92, it decided that common law principles could be applied by United States courts in cases involving interstate commerce, in the absence of United States statutes specifically covering the case. Such is the law of the land.

GREATER MARKETS NEEDED.

In my address to the Notification Committee I said that tariff reform "is demanded by the best interests of both manufacturer and consumer." With equal truth it can be said that the benefits of reciprocal trade treaties would enure to both. That the consumer would be helped is unquestionable. That the manufacturer would receive great benefit by extending his markets abroad hardly needs demonstration. His productive capacity has outgrown the home market. The very term, "home market," has changed in its significance. Once, from the manufacturers' point of view, it meant expansion; to-day the marvelous growth of our manufacturing industries has far exceeded the consumptive capacity of our domestic markets, and the term "home market" implies contraction, rather than expansion. If we would run our mills to their full capacity thus giving steady employment to our work-

The persistent refusal of the Republican majority in the Federal Senate to ratify the reciprocity treaties negotiated in pursuance of the policy advocated alike by Mr. Blaine and Mr. McKinley, and expressly sanctioned in the fourth section of the Dingley act, is a discouraging exhibition of bad faith. As already mentioned by me, the exorbitant duty imposed on many an imported article by the Dingley tariff was avowedly intended by its author not to be permanent, but to serve temporarily as a maximum, from which the Federal Government was empowered to offer a reduction, in return for an equivalent concession on the part of a foreign country. President McKinley undertook honestly to carry out the purpose of this section of the act. A number of reciprocity agreements were negotiated within the prescribed limit of two years, which, if ratified, would have had the two-fold result of cheapening many imported products for American consumers, and of opening and enlarging foreign markets to American producers. Not one of those agreements has met with the approval of the Republican masters of the Senate. Indeed they did not even permit their consideration. In view of the attitude of the present Executive, no new agreement under the general Treaty power need be expected from him. Nor does the Republican platform contain a favorable reference to one of the suspended treaties. This section of the Dingley act stands forth as a monument of legislative coziness and political bad faith.

NO TYRANNY OVER OTHERS.

In some quarters it has been assumed that in the discussion of the Philippine question in my response, the phrase "self-government," was intended to mean something less than independence. It was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it goes mean less than independence. However, to eliminate

RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS

A vast expanse of country in the West, portions of which are to be found in each of the sixteen States and Territories, mentioned in the law, is directly affected by the National statute—the outcome of intelligent and persistent efforts of leading citizens, providing for the reclamation of the arid lands for the benefit of homeseekers. During the years of the development of the measure which finally received the vote of every member of the upper house of Congress, it encountered opposition, based to a large extent upon the view that the aim of its promoters was to secure the benefits of irrigation to private owners at Government expense. The aim of the statute is, however, to enable this vast territory to reclaim its arid lands without calling upon the taxpayers of the country at large to pay for it. Whether the purposes of the bill will be fully accomplished must depend in large measure upon the ability, sobriety of judgment, independence and honesty of the officers of the Interior Department having this great work in charge.

In 1902 the main canals and ditches in the region affected aggregated more than 59,000 miles and the work of reclamation is but in its infancy. The total cost of construction of the necessary head-gates, dams, main canals, ditches, reservoirs and pumping stations at that time was a little over \$95,000,000, which of itself suggests the hundreds of millions that will eventually be invested in the territory covered by the statute. The magnitude of the conception, and the enormous expense its carrying out involves, make us realize the overwhelming importance of a broad, capable and honest administration of the work authorized by the statute, if effect is to be given to that part of the plan that relieves the country at large from ultimate liability.

NATIONAL FAITH BROKEN.

An Isthmian canal has long been the hope of our statesmen, and the avowed aim of the two great parties, as their platforms in the past show. The Panama route having been selected, the building of the canal should be pressed to completion with all reasonable expedition.

The methods by which the Executive acquired the Panama Canal route and rights are a source of regret to many. To them the statement that thereby a great public work was assured to the profit of our people is not a sufficient answer to the charge of violation of National good faith. They appreciate that the principles and healthy convictions which in their working out have made us free and great, stand firmly against the argument or suggestion that we shall be blind to the nature of the means employed to promote our welfare. They hold that adherence to principle, whether it works for our good or ill, will have a more beneficial influence on our future destiny than all our material upbuilding, and that we should ever remember that the idea of doing a wrong to a smaller, weaker nation than we, or even all mankind, may have a resultant good is repugnant to the principles upon which our government was founded.

Under the laws of the United States the duty is imposed on the Executive to proceed with due diligence in the work of constructing the Canal. That duty should be promptly performed.

AMERICAN SHIPPING.

Our commerce in American bottoms amounts to but nine per cent. of our total exports and imports. For forty years prior to 1861, when the Republican party came into power, our merchant marine carried an average of eighty per cent. of our foreign commerce. By 1877 it had dwindled to twenty-seven per cent. Now we carry but a contemptibly small fraction of our exports and imports.

American shipping in the foreign trade was greater by almost one hundred thousand tons in 1810—nearly a hundred years ago—than it was last year. In the face of the continuous decline in the record of American shipping during the last forty-three years, the promise of the Republican party to restore it is without encouragement. The record of the Democratic party gives assurance that the task can be more wisely entrusted to it.

It is an arduous task to undo the effect of forty years of decadence, and requires the study and investigation of those best fitted by experience to find the remedy—which surely does not lie in the granting of subsidies, wringing from the pockets of all the taxpayers.

Recent disclosures, coupled with the rapid augmentation of government expenditures, show a need of an investigation of every department of the government. The Democrats in Congress demanded it. The Republican majority refused the demand. The people can determine by their vote in November whether they wish an honest and thorough investigation. A Democratic Congress and Executive will assure it.

ARMY AND NAVY.

We are justly proud of the officers and men of our Army and Navy. Both, however, have suffered from the persistent injection of personal and political influence. Promotions and appointments have been frequently based on favoritism instead of merit. Trials and court-martials have been set aside under circumstances indicating political interference. These and other abuses should be corrected.

USURPATION IN PENSION ORDER.

The National Democracy favors liberal pensions to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents, on the ground that they deserve liberal treatment. It pledges by its platform adequate legislation to that end. But it denies the right of Congress to legislate on that subject. Such usurpation was attempted by Pension Order No. 78, and effect has been given to it by a Congress that dared not resent the usurpation. It is said that "this order was made in the performance of a duty imposed upon the President by act of Congress," but the provision making the imposition is not pointed out. The act to which the order refers, which is the one relating to pensions to Civil War veterans, does not authorize pensions on the ground of age. It does grant pensions to those "suffering from any mental or physical disability or disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which so incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support." This



FOR PRESIDENT!

try, as manifested in its statutes, makes it necessary that tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken, on scientific principles, to the end that there should not be an immediate revolution in existing conditions.

In the words of our platform we demand "a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses, and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and discriminations."

In my response to your committee I pointed out the method under which a gradual reduction of customs duties may be accomplished without disturbing business conditions. I desire again to express the opinion that this method should be followed.

It is true that the Republicans, who do not admit in their platform that the Dingley tariff needs the slightest alteration, are likely to retain a majority of the Federal Senate throughout the next Presidential term, and could, therefore, if they chose, block every attempt at legislative relief. But it should be remembered that the Republican party includes many revisionists, and I believe it will shrink from defying the popular will expressed unmistakably and peremptorily at the ballot box.

The people demand reform of existing conditions. Since the last Democratic administration the cost of living has grievously increased. Those having fixed incomes have suffered keenly; those living on wages, if there has been any increase, know that such increase has not kept pace with the advance in cost of living, including rent and the necessities of life. Many to-day are out of work, unable to secure any wages at all. To alleviate these conditions, in so far as is in our power, should be our earnest endeavor.

COMMON LAW AND THE TRUSTS.

I pointed out in my earlier response the remedy, which in my judgment, can effectively be applied against monopolies, and the assurance was then given that if existing laws, including both statute and common law, proved

men and securing to them and to the manufacturer the profits accruing from increased production, other markets must be found. Furthermore, when our manufacturers are dependent on raw materials in whole or in part imported, it is vital to the extension of their markets abroad that they secure their materials on the most favorable terms.

Our martyred President, William McKinley, appreciated this situation. He pointed out in his last address to the people that we must make sensible trade arrangements if "we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus." He said, "a system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. . . . The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not."

This argument was made in the interests of our manufacturers, whose products, he urged, "have so multiplied, that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention." He had come to realize that the so-called "stand pat" policy must give way—that there must be a reduction of duties to enable our manufacturers to cultivate foreign markets.

McKINLEY'S LAST WORDS.

The last words of this President—who had won the affection of his countrymen—ought to be studied by every man who has any doubt of the necessity of a reduction in tariff rates in the interest of the manufacturer. They present with clearness a situation and a proposed remedy that prompted the provision in our platform which declares that "We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with other countries where they are entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining or commerce."

all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Philippines what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, cannot be prudently granted to the Philippines at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights; for a free people cannot withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self-government, and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

The pledge of the platform to secure to our citizens, without distinction of race or creed, whether native born or naturalized, at home and abroad, the equal protection of the laws and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges open to them; the covenants of our treaties, as their just due, should be made good to them. In the accomplishment of that result it is essential that a passport issued by the Government of the United States to an American citizen shall be accepted the world over as proof of citizenship.

TO ENFORCE CIVIL SERVICE LAW

The statute relating to Civil Service is the outcome of the efforts of thoughtful, unselfish and public spirited citizens. Operation under it has frequently been of such a character as to offend against the spirit of the statute, but the results achieved, even under a partial enforcement of the law, have been such as to both deserve and command the utterance of the Democratic party that it stands committed to the principle of Civil Service reform and demands its just and impartial enforcement.